arXiv:1502.06245v1 [math.CO] 22 Feb 2015

Changing of the domination number of a graph: edge multisubdivision and edge removal

Vladimir Samodivkin
Department of Mathematics
University of Architecture Civil Engineering and Geodesy
Hristo Smirnenski 1 Blv., 1046 Sofia, Bulgaria,
`vlsam_fte@uacg.bg`

February 24, 2015

Abstract

For a graphical property $\mathcal{P}$ and a graph G, a subset S of vertices of G is a $\mathcal{P}$-set if the subgraph induced by S has the property $\mathcal{P}$. The domination number with respect to the property $\mathcal{P}$, denoted by $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating $\mathcal{P}$-set. We define the domination multisubdivision number with respect to $\mathcal{P}$, denoted by $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$, as a minimum positive integer k such that there exists an edge which must be subdivided k times to change $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$. In this paper (a) we present necessary and sufficient conditions for a change of $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ after subdividing an edge of G once, (b) we prove that if e is an edge of a graph G then $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,1}) < \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ if and only if $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e) < \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ ($G_{e,t}$ denote the graph obtained from G by subdivision of e with t vertices), (c) we also prove that for every edge of a graph G is fulfilled $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,3}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e)+1$, and (d) we show that $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \leq 3$, where $\mathcal{P}$ is hereditary and closed under union with K_1.

Keywords dominating set, edge subdivision, domination multisubdivision number, hereditary graph property

MSC 2010: 05C69

1 Introduction

All graphs considered in this article are finite, undirected, without loops or multiple edges. For the graph theory terminology not presented here, we follow Haynes et al. [9]. We denote the vertex set and the edge set of a graph G by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. The subgraph induced by $S \subseteq V(G)$ is denoted by $\langle S, G\rangle$. For a vertex x of G, $N(x, G)$ denotes the set of all neighbors of x in G, $N[x, G] = N(x, G) \cup \{x\}$ and the degree of x is $deg(x, G) = |N(x, G)|$. The maximum and minimum degrees of vertices in the graph G are denoted by $\Delta(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ respectively. For a graph G, let $x \in X \subseteq V(G)$. A vertex y is a *private neighbor of* x *with respect to* X if $N[y, G] \cap X = \{x\}$. The *private neighbor set of* x *with respect to* X is $pn_G[x, X] = \{y : N[y, G] \cap X = \{x\}\}$. For a graph G subdivision of the edge $e = uv \in E(G)$ with vertex x leads to a graph with vertex set $V \cup \{x\}$ and edge set $(E - \{uv\}) \cup \{ux, xv\}$. Let $G_{e,t}$ denote graph obtained from G by subdivision of the edge e with t vertices (instead of edge $e = uv$ we put a path $(u, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t, v)$). For $t = 1$ we write G_e.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote the set of all mutually non-isomorphic graphs. A *graph property* is any non-empty subset of $\mathcal{I}$. We say that a *graph* G *has the property* $\mathcal{P}$ whenever there exists a graph $H \in \mathcal{P}$ which is isomorphic to G. For example, we list some graph properties:

- $\mathcal{O} = \{H \in \mathcal{I} : H$ is totally disconnected$\}$;
- $\mathcal{C} = \{H \in \mathcal{I} : H$ is connected$\}$;
- $\mathcal{T} = \{H \in \mathcal{I} : \delta(H) \geq 1\}$;
- $\mathcal{F} = \{H \in \mathcal{I} : H$ is a forest$\}$;
- $\mathcal{UK} = \{H \in \mathcal{I} :$ each component of H is complete$\}$;
- $\mathcal{D}_k = \{H \in \mathcal{I} : \Delta(H) \leq k\}$.

A graph property $\mathcal{P}$ is called: (a) hereditary (induced-hereditary), if from the fact that a graph G has property $\mathcal{P}$, it follows that all subgraphs (induced subgraphs) of G also belong to $\mathcal{P}$, and (b) nondegenerate if $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$. Any set $S \subseteq V(G)$ such that the induced subgraph $\langle S, G\rangle$ possesses the property $\mathcal{P}$ is called a $\mathcal{P}$- set. Note that: (a) $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{D}_k$ are nondegenerate and hereditary properties; (b) $\mathcal{UK}$ is nondegenerate, induced-hereditary and is not hereditary; (c) both $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ are neither induced-hereditary nor nondegenerate. For a survey on this subject we refer to Borowiecki et al. [2].

A set of vertices $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a dominating set of a graph G if every vertex not in D is adjacent to a vertex in D. The domination number with respect to the property $\mathcal{P}$, denoted by $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$, is the smallest cardinality of a dominating $\mathcal{P}$-set of G. A dominating $\mathcal{P}$-set of G with cardinality $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ is called a $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$*-set of* G.

If a property $\mathcal{P}$ is nondegenerate, then every maximal independent set is a $\mathcal{P}$-set and thus $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ exists. Note that $\gamma_{\mathcal{I}}(G)$, $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(G)$, $\gamma_{\mathcal{C}}(G)$, $\gamma_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$,$\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G)$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{D}_k}(G)$, are the well known as the domination number $\gamma(G)$, the independent domination number $i(G)$, the connected domination number $\gamma_c(G)$, the total domination number $\gamma_t(G)$, the acyclic domination number $\gamma_a(G)$ and the k-dependent domination number $\gamma^k(G)$, respectively (see [9]). The concept of domination with respect to any graph property $\mathcal{P}$ was introduced by Goddard et al. [5] and has been studied, for example, in [10, 11, 12, 13, 14] and elsewhere.

It is often of interest to know how the value of a graph parameter is affected when a small change is made in a graph. In [11], the present author began the study of the effects on $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ when a graph G is modified by deleting a vertex or by adding an edge ($\mathcal{P}$ is nondegenerate). In this paper we concentrate on effects on $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ when a graph is modified by deleting/subdividing an edge. An edge e of a graph G is called a $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$-ER^--critical edge of G if $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G) > \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e)$. Note that (a) there do not exist γ-ER^--critical edges (see [8]), (b) Grobler [6] was the first who began the investigation of $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$-ER^--critical edges when $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{O}$, and (c) necessary and sufficient conditions for an edge of a graph G to be $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-ER^--critical may be found in [11].

When an edge of a graph G is subdivided, the domination number with respect to the property $\mathcal{P}$ can increase or decrease. For instance, if G is a star $K_{1,p}$, $p \geq 2$, and $\{K_1, 2K_1\} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ then $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = 1$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_e) = 2$ for all e. If a graph G is obtained by three stars $K_{1,p}$ and three edges e_1, e_2, e_3 joining their centers then $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G) = 2 + p$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(G_{e_i}) = 3$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. This motivates the next definitions.

For any nondegenerate property $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ we define the edge e of a graph G to be (a) a $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$-S^+-critical edge of G if $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G) < \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_e)$, and (b) a $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$-S^--critical edge of G if $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G) > \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_e)$. In Section 2: (a) we present necessary and sufficient conditions for a change of $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ after subdividing an edge of G once, and (b) we prove that an edge e of a graph G is $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-S$^-$-critical if and only if e is $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-ER^--critical, where $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is any induced-hereditary and closed under union with K_1 graph property.

In Section 3 we deals with changing of $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ when an edge of G is multiple subdivided. To present our results we need the following definitions.

For every edge e of a graph G let

- $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(e) = \min\{t \mid \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,t}) \neq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)\}$;
- $msd^+_{\mathcal{P}}(e) = \min\{t \mid \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,t}) > \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)\}$;
- $msd^-_{\mathcal{P}}(e) = \min\{t \mid \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,t}) < \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)\}$.

If $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,t}) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ for every t, $t \geq 1$, then we write $msd^-_{\mathcal{P}}(e) = \infty$. If $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,t}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ for every t, $t \geq 1$, then we write $msd^+_{\mathcal{P}}(e) = \infty$.

For every graph G with at least one edge and every nondegenerate property $\mathcal{P}$, we define:

(**$\mathbf{D_1}$**) the domination multisubdivision (plus domination multisubdivision, minus domination multisubdivision) number with respect to the property $\mathcal{P}$, denoted $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ ($msd^+_{\mathcal{P}}, msd^-_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$, respectively) to be

- $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \min\{msd_{\mathcal{P}}(e) \mid e \in E(G)\}$,
- $msd^+_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \min\{msd^+_{\mathcal{P}}(e) \mid e \in E(G)\}$, and
- $msd^-_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \min\{msd^-_{\mathcal{P}}(e) \mid e \in E(G)\}$,

respectively. If $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,t}) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ for every t, and every edge $e \in E(G)$, then we write $msd^-_{\mathcal{P}}(G) = \infty$.

The parameters $msd^+(G)$ and $msd^+_{\mathcal{T}}(G)$ (in our designation) was introduced by Dettlaff, Raczek and Topp in [4] and by Avella-Alaminos, Dettlaff, Lemańska and Zuazua [1], respectively. Note that in the case when $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{I}$, clearly, $msd(G) = msd^+(G)$, and $msd^-(G) = \infty$. In Section 3 we prove that for every edge of a graph G is fulfilled $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,3}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e)+1$ and we present necessary and sufficient conditions for the validity of $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e) = \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,3})$. Our main result in this section is that $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G) \leq 3$ for any graph G and any hereditary and closed under union with K_1 graph-property $\mathcal{P}$.

2 Single subdivision: critical edges

We begin this section with a characterization of $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$-S^+-critical edges of a graph. Note that if a property $\mathcal{P}$ is induced-hereditary and closed under union with K_1 then $\mathcal{P}$ is nondegenerate.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be hereditary and closed under union with K_1. Let G be a graph and $e = uv \in E(G)$. Then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)+1$. If e is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-S^+-critical edge of G then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)+1$ and for each $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set M of G one of the following holds:*

(i) $u, v \in V(G) - M$;

(ii) $u \in M$, $v \in pn_G[u, M]$ and $pn_G[u, M]$ is not a subset of $\{u, v\}$;

(iii) $v \in M$, $u \in pn_G[v, M]$ and $pn_G[u, M]$ is not a subset of $\{u, v\}$.

If e is not $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$-S^+-critical and for each $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set M of G one of (i), (ii) and (iii) holds then there is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set R of $G - uv$ with $u, v \in R$ and $|R| \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$.

Proof. Let $x \in V(G_e)$ be the subdivision vertex and let M be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G. If $u, v \notin M$ then $M \cup \{x\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G_e ($\mathcal{H}$ is closed under union with K_1) and we have $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) + 1$. If both u and v are in M then M is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G_e($\mathcal{H}$ is hereditary) which implies $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. If $u \in M$, $v \notin M$ and $v \notin pn_G[u, M]$ then again M is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G_e and hence $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. So, let $u \in M$, $v \notin M$ and $v \in pn_G[u, M]$. If either $\{v\}$ or $\{u, v\}$ coincides with $pn_G[u, M]$ then $(M - \{u\}) \cup \{x\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G_e; hence $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. If neither $pn_G[u, M] = \{v\}$ nor $pn_G[u, M] = \{u, v\}$ then $M \cup \{v\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G_e and we have $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) + 1$. Thus $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) + 1$ and if the equality is fulfilled then one of (i), (ii) and (iii) holds.

Now, let for each $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set M of G one of (i), (ii) and (iii) hold. Assume $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$ and let R be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G_e.

Case 1: $u, v \notin R$. Hence $x \in R$. If $u, v \notin pn_{G_e}[x, R]$ then $R - \{x\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G, a contradiction with $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. If $u \in pn_{G_e}[x, R]$ and $v \notin pn_{G_e}[x, R]$ then $R_1 = (R - \{x\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G of cardinality $|R_1| = |R| = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e)$. Since $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$, we have that R_1 is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G. But then $u \in R_1$, $v \notin R_1$ and $v \notin pn_G[u, R_1]$, contradicting (ii). If $u, v \in pn_G[x, R]$ then as above R_1 is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G and since $u \in R_1$ and $\{u, v\} = pn_G[u, R_1]$, again we arrive to a contradiction with (ii).

Case 2: $u \in R$ and $v \notin R$. Hence $x \notin R$, otherwise $R - \{x\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G, contradicting $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. This implies that R is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G, $u \in R$ and $v \notin pn_G[u, R]$, a contradiction with (ii).

Case 3: $u, v \in R$. Hence R is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - uv$ and $|R| = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. ■

When we restrict our attention to the case where $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{I}$, we can describe more precisely when an edge of a graph G is γ-S$^+$-critical.

Corollary 2.2. *Let G be a graph and $e = uv \in E(G)$. Then e is a γ-S^+-critical edge of G if and only if for each γ-set M of G one of (i), (ii) and (iii) stated in Theorem 2.1 holds.*

Proof. *Necessity*: The result immediately follows by Theorem 2.1.

Sufficiency: Assume $\gamma(G_e) \leq \gamma(G)$. Then by Theorem 2.1, there is a dominating set R of $G - uv$ with $u, v \in R$ and $|R| \leq \gamma(G)$. But it is well known fact that if f is an edge of a graph G then always $\gamma(G - f) \geq \gamma(G)$. Hence R is a γ-set of both G and $G - e$ and $u, v \in R$, contradicting all (i), (ii) and (iii). ■

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be induced-hereditary and closed under union with K_1. An edge e of a graph G is $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-S^--critical if and only if e is $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-ER^--critical.*

Proof. As we have already know, $\mathcal{H}$ is nondegenerate and then all $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)$, $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e)$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$ exist. Let v be the subdivision vertex of G_e.

Sufficiency: Let $e = xy$ be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-ER^--critical edge of G and M a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G-e$. Hence $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) < \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$ and $x, y \in M$. But then M is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G_e which leads to $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) < \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$.

Necessity: Let $e = xy$ be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-S$^-$-critical edge of G and M a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G_e. Hence $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_e) < \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. Assume $v \notin M$. Hence at least one of x and y is in M. If both $x, y \in M$ then M is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G-e$ and the result follows. If $x \notin M$ and $y \in M$ then M is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G, a contradiction. Thus we may assume v is in all $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-sets of G_e. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is induced-hereditary, at least one of x and y is not in M. First let $x \in M$ and $y \notin M$. Then $y \in pn_{G_e}[v, M]$ which implies $M - \{v\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G - a contradiction. Hence both x and y are not in M. If $x, y \notin pn_{G_e}[v, M]$ then $M - \{v\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G, a contradiction. Hence at least one of x and y, say y, is in $pn_{G_e}[v, M]$. But then $(M - \{v\}) \cup \{y\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of G, a contradiction. ■

Note that (a) there do not exist γ-ER^--critical edges (see [8]), and (b) necessary and sufficient conditions for an edge of a graph G to be $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-ER^--critical may be found in [11]. Now we define the following classes of graphs:

- $(CS^-_{\mathcal{P}})$ $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G) > \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_e)$ for every edge e of G, and
- $(CER^-_{\mathcal{P}})$ $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G) > \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e)$ for every edge e of G.

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.3 we obtain the next result.

Corollary 2.4. *If $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is induced-hereditary and closed under union with K_1 then the classes of graphs $(CS^-_{\mathcal{P}})$ and $(CER^-_{\mathcal{P}})$ coincide.*

Note that the class $(CER^-_{\mathcal{P}})$ in the case when $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{O}$ was introduced by Grobler [6] and also considered in [7, 8, 3].

3 Multiple subdivision

Recall that $G_{e,t}$ denote the graph obtained from a graph G by subdivision of the edge $e \in E(G)$ with t vertices (instead of edge $e = uv$ we put a path $(u, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_t, v)$). For any graph G and any nondegenerate property $\mathcal{P}$ let us denote by $V^-_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ the set $\{v \in V(G) \mid \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-v) < \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G)\}$. Qur first result shows that the value of the difference $\gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G_{e,3}) - \gamma_{\mathcal{P}}(G-e)$ can be either 0 or 1.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be induced-hereditary and closed under union with K_1. If $e = uv$ is an edge of a graph G then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) + 1$. Moreover, the following conditions are equivalent:*

($\mathbb{A}_1$) $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$;

($\mathbb{A}_2$) at least one of the following holds:

(i) $u \in V^-_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)$ and v belongs to some $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G-u$;
(ii) $v \in V^-_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)$ and u belongs to some $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G-v$.

If in addition $\mathcal{H}$ is hereditary then ($\mathbb{A}_1$) and ($\mathbb{A}_2$) are equivalent to

($\mathbb{A}_3$) $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)=1+\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$.

The main result in this section is the following.

Theorem 3.2. *Let e be an edge of a graph G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be hereditary and closed under union with K_1.*

(i) Then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$ if and only if $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)+1$.

(ii) If $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)+1$ then $msd_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=msd^-_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=1$, $msd^+_{\mathcal{H}}(e)=6$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,1})+1=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,2})+1=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,4})=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,5})=\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,6})-1$.

(iii) Then $msd_{\mathcal{H}}(e) \leq 3$. In particular, (Dettlaff, Raczek and Topp [4] when $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{I}$) $msd_{\mathcal{H}}(G) \leq 3$.

Example 3.3. *It is easy to see that if $G=K_{3n_2..n_m}$, where $m \geq 2$ and $n_i \geq 3$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$, then $\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(G)=\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(G_{e,3})=\gamma_{\mathcal{O}}(G-e)+1=3$ for every edge e of G. Hence by Theorem 3.2, $msd_{\mathcal{O}}(G)=msd^-_{\mathcal{O}}(G)=1$ and $msd^+_{\mathcal{O}}(G)=6$.*

In view of Theorem 3.2(iii), we can split the family of all graphs G into three classes with respect to the value of $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$, where $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is hereditary and closed under union with K_1. We define that a graph G belongs to the class $S^i_{\mathcal{P}}$ whenever $msd_{\mathcal{P}}(G)=i$, $i \in \{1,2,3\}$. It is straightforward to verify that if $k \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ then

- $P_{3k}, C_{3k} \in S^1_{\mathcal{P}}$; $P_{3k+2}, C_{3k+2} \in S^2_{\mathcal{P}}$; and $P_{3k+1}, C_{3k+1} \in S^3_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Thus, none of $S^1_{\mathcal{P}}, S^2_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $S^3_{\mathcal{P}}$ is empty.

We conclude this part with an open problem.

Problem 3.4. *Characterize the graphs belonging to $S^i_{\mathcal{P}}$, or find further properties of such graphs.*

Remark that Dettlaff, Raczek and Topp recently characterized all trees belonging to S^1 and S^3 (see [4]).

3.1 Proofs

For the proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.1, we need the following results.

Theorem A ([11]). *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be nondegenerate and closed under union with K_1. Let G be a graph and $v \in V(G)$.*

(i) If v belongs to no $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - v) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$.

(ii) If $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - v) < \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$ then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - v) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) - 1$. Moreover, if M is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - v$ then $M \cup \{v\}$ is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of G and $\{v\} = pn_G[v, M \cup \{v\}]$.

Theorem B ([11]). *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be hereditary and closed under union with K_1. Let $e = uv$ be an edge of a graph G. If $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) < \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)$ then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)-1$. Moreover $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) - 1$ if and only if at least one of the conditions (i) and (ii) stated in Theorem 3.1 holds.*

Theorem C ([11]). *Let $e = xy$ be an edge of a graph G and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ be hereditary and closed under union with K_1. If $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) > \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$ then:*

(i) no $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - e$ is an $\mathcal{H}$-set of G;

(ii) both x and y are in all $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-sets of $G - e$;

(iii) $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - x) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - y) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$;

(iv) if $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - x) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$ then y belongs to no $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - x$;

(v) if $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - y) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$ then x belongs to no $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - y$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let D be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - e$. Then since $\mathcal{H}$ is closed under union with K_1, $D \cup \{x_2\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G_{e,3}$. Hence $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) \leq |D \cup \{y\}| \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 1$.

For the left side inequality, let $\widetilde{D}$ be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G_{e,3}$ and $S = \widetilde{D} \cap \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. If $S = \{x_2\}$ then $\widetilde{D} - \{x_2\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) \leq |\widetilde{D} - \{x_2\}| = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) - 1$. If $S = \{x_1, x_2\}$ then $pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}] = \{u\}$ and hence $\widetilde{D}_1 = (\widetilde{D} - \{x_1, x_2\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$ which implies $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) \leq |\widetilde{D}_1| < |\widetilde{D}| = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$.

Let $S = \{x_1\}$. If $u \in pn[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ then $\widetilde{D}_2 = (\widetilde{D} - \{x_1\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$ and hence $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) \leq |\widetilde{D}_2| = |\widetilde{D}| = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$. If $u \notin pn[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ then $\widetilde{D} - \{x_1\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) \leq |\widetilde{D}| - 1 = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) - 1$.

If $S = \{x_1, x_3\}$ then at least one of $pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}] = \{x_1, u\}$ and $pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_3, \widetilde{D}] = \{x_3, v\}$ holds, otherwise $(\widetilde{D} - \{x_1, x_3\}) \cup \{x_2\}$ would be a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G_{e,3}$, contradicting the choice of $\widetilde{D}$. Say, without loss of generality, $pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_3, \widetilde{D}] = \{x_3, v\}$. Then $\widetilde{D}_3 = (\widetilde{D} - \{x_3\}) \cup \{v\}$ is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G_{e,3}$ and $\widetilde{D}_3 \cap \{x_1, x_2, x_3\} = \{x_1\}$. As above we obtain $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) < \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$. By reason of symmetry, the left side inequality is proved.

$(\mathbb{A}_2) \Rightarrow (\mathbb{A}_1)$ Assume without loss of generality that (i) holds. Let D be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u)$-set and $v \in D$. By Theorem A, $D \cup \{u\}$ is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - e$ and $pn_{G-e}[u, D \cup \{u\}] = \{u\}$. Hence $D \cup \{x_1\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G_{e,3}$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) \leq |D \cup \{x_1\}| = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$. But we have already known that $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$. Therefore $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$.

$(\mathbb{A}_1) \Rightarrow (\mathbb{A}_2)$ Suppose $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$. Let $\widetilde{D}$ be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$-set and $S = \widetilde{D} \cap \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. If $S = \{x_2\}$ then $\widetilde{D} - \{x_2\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$, a contradiction. If $S = \{x_1, x_2\}$ then clearly $pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}] = \{u\}$ which implies that $(\widetilde{D} - \{x_1, x_2\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$, a contradiction.

Let $S = \{x_1\}$. Hence $v \in \widetilde{D}$. If $u \notin pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ then $\widetilde{D} - \{x_1\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$, a contradiction. If $u \in pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ then $D_1 = (\widetilde{D} - \{x_1\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - e$, $u, v \in D_1$, $D_1 - \{u\}$ is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - u$ (by Theorem A) and $v \in D_1 - \{u\}$. In addition it follows that $u \in V^-_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$. Thus, (i) holds.

By symmetry it remains the case when $S = \{x_1, x_3\}$. If $u \notin pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ and $v \notin pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_3, \widetilde{D}]$ then $\widetilde{D} - \{x_1, x_3\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$, a contradiction. If $u \in pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ and $v \notin pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_3, \widetilde{D}]$ then $(\widetilde{D} - \{x_1, x_3\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$, a contradiction. So, $u \in pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_1, \widetilde{D}]$ and $v \in pn_{G_{e,3}}[x_3, \widetilde{D}]$. Then $D_2 = (\widetilde{D} - \{x_1, x_3\}) \cup \{u, v\}$ is a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - e$ and both $\{u\} = pn_{G-e}[x_1, D_2]$ and $\{v\} = pn_{G-e}[x_3, D_2]$ hold. Thus both (i) and (ii) are fulfilled.

$(\mathbb{A}_2) \Leftrightarrow (\mathbb{A}_3)$ By Theorem B. ■

Proof of Theorem 3.2. (i) *Necessity*: Let $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$. By Theorem 3.1 we know that $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e)+1$ and if $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G-e) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$ then $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) + 1$. Thus $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 1$.

Sufficiency: Let $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 1 = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$. Assume $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) \neq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$. Now by Theorem 3.1, $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$. Applying again Theorem 3.1 we obtain $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) - 1$, a contradiction. Thus, $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$.

(ii) By (i), $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,3})$. Let M be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - e$ and $e = uv$. By Theorem C(ii), both u and v are in M. Then (a) M is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G_{e,1}$ and $G_{e,2}$, (b) $M \cup \{x_3\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G_{e,4}$ and $G_{e,5}$, and (c) $M \cup \{x_3, x_5\}$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G_{e,6}$. Hence

(A) $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,i}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) - 1$ for $i = 1, 2$; $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,j}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 1 = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$ for $i = 4, 5$; $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,6}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 2 = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) + 1$.

By Theorem C, $\min\{\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u), \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - v)\} \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$ and by Theorem A we have $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - \{u, v\}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}((G - u) - v) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u) - 1 \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) - 1$. Suppose that $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - \{u, v\}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) - 1$. Then both $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$ and $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}((G - u) - v) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u) - 1$ hold. By the second equality and Theorem A we deduce that v belongs to some $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - u$. On the other hand, since $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 1 > \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u)$, v belongs to no $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G - u$, a contradiction. Thus,

(B) $\min\{\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - u), \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - v), \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - \{u, v\})\} \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$.

Let D_t be a $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}$-set of $G_{e,t}$ and $U_t = D_t \cap \{x_1, \ldots, x_t\}$, where $t = 1, \ldots, 6$.

Case 1: $t \in \{1, 2\}$.

Assume $U_t \neq \emptyset$. Then $D_t - U_t$ is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set for at least one of the graphs $G - e$, $G - u$, $G - v$ and $G - \{u, v\}$. Using (B) we have

$$\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e) + 1 \leq |D_t - U_t| + 1 = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t}) - |U_t| + 1 \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t}),$$

contradicting (A). Thus U_t is empty. But then D_t is a dominating $\mathcal{H}$-set of $G - e$ which leads to $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t}) \geq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$. Now by (A) it follows the equality $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G - e)$.

Case 2: $t \in \{4, 5\}$.

Obviously $U_t \neq \emptyset$. As in Case 1 we obtain $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t})$. Since by (A) $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t}) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$, we have $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,t}) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G)$.

Case 3: $t = 6$.

Clearly $|U_6| \geq 2$. As in Case 1 we obtain $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,6}) - |U_6| + 1$. Since $|U_6| \geq 2$, $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) \leq \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,6}) - 1$. Now by (A) we deduce that $\gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G) = \gamma_{\mathcal{H}}(G_{e,6}) - 1$.

(iii) Immediately by (i) and (ii). ■

References

[1] D. Avella-Alaminos, M. Dettlaff, M. Lemańska, R. Zuazua, Total domination multisubdivision number of a graph, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory(accepted). http://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.7228v1.pdf

[2] M. Borowiecki, I. Broere, M. Frick, P. Mihok and G. Semanisin, A survey of hereditary properties of graphs, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory, 17(1997) 5–50

[3] E. J. Cockayne, O. Favaron, C. M. Mynhardt, On i^--ER-critical graphs, Discrete Math. 276(2004), 111–125.

[4] M. Dettlaff, J. Raczek and J. Topp, Domination subdivision and domination multisubdivision numbers of graphs, http://arxiv.org/pdf/1310.1345v2.pdf

[5] W. Goddard, T. Haynes and D. Knisley, Hereditary domination and independence parameters, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory. 24(2004), 239-248.

[6] P.J.P. Grobler, Critical concepts in domination, independence and irredundance of graphs, Ph.D. Thesis, University of South Africa, 1998.

[7] P.J.P. Grobler, C.M. Mynhardt, Upper domination parameters and edge-critical graphs, J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput. 33 (2000) 239–251.

[8] P. J. P. Grobler, C. M. Mynhardt, Domination parameters and edge-removal-critical graphs, Discrete Math. 231(2001), 221–239.

[9] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, P. J. Slater, *Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, NY, 1998.

[10] D. Michalak, Domination, independence and irredundance with respect to additive induced-hereditary properties, Discrete Math. 286(2004), 141-146.

[11] V. Samodivkin, Domination with respect to nondegenerate and hereditary properties, Mathematica Bohemica, 133(2008), 167-178.

[12] V. Samodivkin, Domination with respect to nondegenerate properties: bondage number, Australasian J. Combin., 45(2009), 217-226.

[13] V. Samodivkin, Domination with respect to nondegenerate properties: vertex and edge removal, Mathematica Bohemica, 138(2013), 75-85.

[14] V. Samodivkin, Upper bounds for the domination subdivision numbers of graphs on topological surfaces, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 63 (138) (2013), 191–204